DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 849 HE 006 026

AUTHOR Jenkins, Martin D.; Ross, Bernard H.
TITLE The Urban Involvement of Higher Education in the 1970s. Summary Report of Four 1974 Regional Conferences.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Office of Urban Affairs.; Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 42p.; Report of four 1974 regional conferences held March 1-2, Washington; March 15-16, San Francisco; March 29-30, Chicago; April 5-6, New Orleans

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *City Problems; Educational Administration; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Urban Education; *Urban Extension

ABSTRACT

The regional conferences were sponsored by the Office of Urban Affairs of the American Council of Education. The major purpose of the conferences was to encourage and assist college and university administrators and faculty members to give systematic thought to the dimensions of their involvement in urban affairs during the 1970's, with emphasis on their participation in federally funded urban programs. This document reports the proceedings of each conference in relation to the theme and plan of the conference, interpretive summary of the conferences, opportunities for the urban involvement of colleges and universities, suggestions derived from the regional conferences, and problems and issues. (MJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Urban Involvement of Higher Education in the 1970s

Summary Report of Four 1974 Regional Conferences

by

Martin D. Jenkins
Conference Director, and Director
Office of Urban Affairs
American Council on Education

Bernard H. Ross
Conference Consultant, and
Director, Urban Affairs Program
School of Government and Public Administration
The American University

Sponsored by

Office of Urban Affairs of the
American Council on Education
and
host colleges and universities in each conference center:
Washington: March 1-2, Mayflower Hotel
San Francisco: March 15-16, Jack Tar Hotel
Chicago: March 29-30, Drake Hotel
New Orleans: April 5-6, Braniff Place Hotel

HE 006 026

Contents

Foreword iii

I
Theme and Plan of the Conference 1

II
Interpretive Summary of the Conferences 3

III
Opportunities for the Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities 9

IV
Suggestions Derived from the Regional Conferences 16

V
A Task for the Future: Problems and Issues 19

Appendix A
Copy of List of Selected References Distributed at the Conferences 21

Appendix B
Programs of the Four Regional Conferences 22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

American Council on Education
COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

Terms Expire 1974
Oscar A. Anderson, President, Augsburg College
Harry Bard, President, Community College of Baltimore
Winnie Bengelsdorf, Administrator, Office of Urban Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Glen R. Driscoll, President, University of Toledo
Lloyd H. Elliott, President, George Washington University
John A. Greenlee, President, California State University at Los Angeles; *Chairman*
Doris Hanson, Executive Director, American Home Economics Association
Ermon O. Hogan, Director of Education, National Urban League, Inc.
Roy Jones, Director, Community Studies, Howard University
Noah N. Langdale, Jr., President, Georgia State University
George Nash, Project Director, Drug Abuse Treatment Information Project, Montclair State College
Granville M. Sawyer, President, Texas Southern University
Robert C. Weaver, Distinguished Professor of Urban Affairs, Hunter College, The City University of New York
Lawrence A. Williams, Staff Director, Urban Observatory, The National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors

Board of Directors ex officio member
Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., President, Association of Community and Junior Colleges

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE 1974 CONFERENCES

Each regional conference was sponsored jointly by the American Council on Education and the host institutions. The institutional representatives constituted the local Executive Committee.

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 1-2, 1974

Chairman: Morris W.H. Collins, Jr., Dean, College of Public Affairs, **The American University**

The American University, A. Lee Fritschler
The Catholic University of America, Kenneth Bertrand
District of Columbia Teachers College, Robert E. Williams
The Federal City College, Casey Mann II
Georgetown University, Joseph Pettit
The George Washington University, Dorn McGrath
Howard University, Laurence Gary
Montgomery College, Joan C. Lomax
University of Maryland, College Park, Thomas P. Murphy
Washington Technical Institute, Norman W. Nickens

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, March 15-16, 1974

Chairman: Richard M. Sax, Executive Director, **The San Francisco Consortium**

Bank of America, Stanley Hebert
California State University, Hayward, Ellis E. McCune
Community College District, Louis F. Batmale
Golden Gate University, Otto Butz
Lone Mountain College, Bernice B. Brown
Mills College, Kay J. Anderson
San Francisco State University, Paul F. Romberg
Stanford University, Henry S. Rowen
University of California, Berkeley, Albert H. Bowker
University of San Francisco, William C. McInnes
U.S. Human Resources Corporation, Herman Gallegos

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, March 29-30, 1974

Chairman: Michael B. Goldstein, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Urban Affairs, **University of Illinois at Chicago Circle**

Chicago State University, Soloman Flores
City Colleges (Loop College), Salvatore Rotella
Loyola University, Michael E. Schiltz
Northeastern Illinois University, Reynold Feldman
Northwestern University, David Epperson
Roosevelt University, Arthur Hillman
University of Chicago, Doris Holleb
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Roger Pulliam

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA, April 5-6, 1974

Chairman: David R. Deener, Provost, **Tulane University**

Delgado Vocational-Technical Junior College, Raymond Witte
Dillard University, Daniel C. Thompson
Loyola University, David A. Boileau
Our Lady of Holy Cross College, Betty Morrison
St. Mary's Dominican College, Lawrence Hallaron II
Southern University in New Orleans, George W. Parker
University of New Orleans, Ralph E. Thayer
Xavier University, Carrie McHenry

[See conference committees and staff on cover 3]

Foreword

The conferences whose proceedings are reported in this volume were made possible by a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, registration fees, and the contributed services of the American Council on Education. The Council's Office of Urban Affairs is supported primarily by a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and is under the direction of Dr. Martin D. Jenkins. These conferences were initiated by Dr. Jenkins and executed under his general supervision.

The American Council on Education deeply appreciated the contributions of the many persons involved in planning and implementing the regional conferences. In addition to Dr. Jenkins, special mention should be made of the chairmen of the advisory committee and the four local executive committees; Dr. Bernard H. Ross of The American University, who assisted in preparing this Report; Dr. Dorothy Williams of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, who was the Government Technical Representative for this project; and Patricia Tatum Williams of the American Council on Education, who as Conference Coordinator took care of most of the administrative matters incident to the conferences.

I share the general view of the participants at these conferences that cooperation between colleges, universities, and urban agencies should be more frequent and of better quality. Much can be gained for both parties and, most importantly, for the nation. It is my hope and expectation that this Report will be helpful to those working on the task of closer collaboration.

ROGER W. HEYNS
PRESIDENT
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1 Theme and Plan of the Conferences

The regional conferences herein reported were held in Washington, March 1-2, 1974; San Francisco, March 15-16; Chicago, March 29-30; and New Orleans, April 5-6. They were sponsored by the Office of Urban Affairs of the American Council on Education and the host institutions in each of the conference centers.

College and university administrators are virtually unanimous in the view that urban involvement should be a function of higher education. A large majority of the nation's colleges and universities have, in some measure, related their programs of instruction, research, and public service, to urban needs. There is no clear consensus, however, about the most effective roles of these institutions; what things colleges and universities can best do within the context of their major functions; their relationships with Federal, State, and local government agencies; or the financing of urban programs. Institutions of higher education render service to the urban communities by "just being there," but there is a real question, in the opinion of many persons, of whether or not such institutions can have more than a cosmetic effect on the many problems of our contemporary urban culture.

Purposes

The major purpose of the conferences was to encourage and assist college and university administrators and faculty members to give systematic thought to the dimensions of their involvement in urban affairs during the 1970s, with emphasis on their participation in federally funded urban programs. No attempt was made to develop prototype programs for colleges and universities; the extent of urban involvement must be determined by each institution consistent with its objectives, resources, and location. Other important purposes were to make Federal, State, and local governments, and foundations more aware and knowledgeable of the resources of higher education in contributing to the alleviation of urban problems.

Conference Programs

Invitations to attend the conferences were sent to the chief executive officers of all accredited colleges and universities with the request that they designate institutional policymakers as delegates. The conference programs were designed for such an audience. Although there were individual variations, each conference provided a keynote speaker to cover the range of urban involvement; concurrent sessions to present models of urban affairs programs and to indicate problems and needed future developments; federal government officials to discuss opportunities, problems, and prospects of college and university involvement of Federally funded urban programs; State, city, and county officials to indicate how State and local governments can interact with colleges and universities in urban programs; foundation officials to present their experiences and views of supporting urban affairs programs; (in San Francisco) representatives of business to discuss how the business community can interact with colleges and universities in urban programs; and a wrap-up session to explore what changes are needed in colleges and universities to expand their urban involvement. Provision, perhaps insufficient, was made throughout the conferences for audience participation. A total of 242 persons participated in the programs of the four conferences, and, with the exception of the four keynote speakers, none of the program participants received honoraria; all paid their own expenses incident to attending the conferences.

Planning

Planning the conference programs was no easy task. Both the urban scene and the urban interface of higher education are so complex that it is impossible to cover all aspects or to include all relevant groups in a single series of two-day conferences. With this limitation, though, the conferences included a wide range of topics and brought together representatives of diverse groups concerned about the urban scene.

The conference programs were carefully organized with some ninety individuals directly participating in the planning process. The director and planning committee devised the general format, which was then reviewed by the advisory committee. Each local executive committee formulated its own program variations and invited representatives of area colleges and universities to serve as panel members, chairmen, and recorders. The panel members designated to consider the interaction of higher education with State and local governments were selected by organizations representing levels of government—the National

League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Governors Conference, the Council of State Governments, the National Association of Counties, and the International City Management Association. The chairmen of the appropriate Federal regional councils arranged for Federal personnel to participate on panels discussing opportunities for college and university involvement in Federal urban programs. Several foundations and business firms provided participants for aspects of the programs.

Definitions

For the purposes of the conferences the following definitions were used:

> The term *urban* as used here includes both the central city and the adjacent suburbs. *Metropolitan* would be a more accurate designation than *urban*, since urban problems do not stop at the city line.
>
> The urban affairs program of a college or university relates to the institution's involvement in the entire range of urban problems: the disadvantaged, race relations, education, housing, employment, health services, legal services, law enforcement, city management, urban planning and design, transportation, ecology, preparation of students for urban occupations and for urban living.
>
> Urban involvement should be considered in the context of the three commonly recognized major functions of institutions of higher education--instruction, research, and service.
>
> Viewed broadly, an urban affairs program involved virtually every aspect of the institutional program: administration and organization, recruiting and admissions, curriculum, instruction, counseling, financial aid, student activities, cooperative relations with other colleges and organizations, research, community relations; the academic departments; the continuing education program; and most of the constituent schools and colleges such as medicine, law, theology, and architecture.*

Registration

A total of 868 delegates, including representatives of 404 colleges and universities, 33 Federal government agencies, and 27 State and local government agencies, registered for the four conferences. Of the institutional representatives, 13 percent were presidents or chancellors, and 24 percent provosts, vice-presidents, deans, or directors.

Taken together the conferences constituted the largest single effort that has been made to consider the urban role of higher education.

---

*Martin D. Jenkins, *Guidelines for Institutional Self-Study of Involvement in Urban Affairs*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1971, pp. 2, 5.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2 Interpretive Summary of the Conferences

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This chapter is an interpretive summary of some of the major ideas gleaned from presentations at the four regional conferences. Important points have been excerpted from keynote and luncheon speeches, and from statements by state and local government representatives, representatives of Federal agencies, and spokesmen for foundations and the business community.* The more important ideas raised in the concurrent panels will be discussed in the next chapter.

Several themes were voiced continuously throughout the four conferences. With little dissent, there was general agreement that higher education institutions should be involved in urban activities in their communities. The few dissenters focused upon the belief that teaching and research—urban oriented or not—should be the primary considerations of college and university planning and development.

A second theme which recurred throughout the conferences was the inability of higher education as yet to clearly define its role in urban involvement. There was agreement that colleges and universities "can't do everything," and that each institution with its different resources, student body composition, and local environment should be encouraged to work out that form of involvement which best suits its mission as well as the needs of the community. Several participants, however, regarded the variety of university responses to urban affairs as a strength rather than a problem.

A final theme to emerge concerned the lack of a theory of urban involvement. It was agreed, however, that the most relevant components of such a theory—if one does evolve—would be total institutional commitment and broad metropolitan approach, as opposed to a localized focus.

Keynote Speakers

The keynote speakers at the four conferences came from different types of higher education institutions in four different parts of the United States.** Two of the speakers approached their subject from a historical perspective (Wachman, Bennis), one was very contemporary in nature (McInnes), and one was theoretical (Sawyer). In all four speeches, some similar themes surfaced, and together they provided both a rationale and an approach to a theory of urban involvement.

Each of the keynote speakers sounded an optimistic note about the need, desire, and competency of higher education institutions to become actively involved in urban programs. Furthermore, they all agreed that the involvement need not diminish the accepted, traditional roles of higher education—teaching, research, and public service. Rather, the modern urban college and university must learn to relate all three functions to contemporary life.

Other themes in the keynote addresses concerned the development of "urban grant colleges"—higher education institutions that closely resemble the nineteenth century agricultural model—and the need for a clearer relationship between the human makeup of colleges and universities and our urban environment.

Two of the keynote speakers prefaced their remarks with assumptions about university-community relations (McInnes, Sawyer), some of which were:

- Institutions of higher education are prominent components of an urban society.
- Urban involvement of colleges and universities is a recent development.
- There is no natural affinity for interaction between higher education and local government.
- Urban problems are those of society at large; they are not the concern of only higher education or local government.
- Urban involvement is not simply an attractive alternative for higher education; it is basic to the traditional functions of the university.

The role of urban involvement is one that post-secondary education has largely neglected in the past. Urban colleges and universities are being called upon in the 1970s as never before to bring a new meaning to life in urban communities (Sawyer). During the 1960s, major social changes took place that created tremendous pressure on key institutions of government. These institutions turned to colleges and universities for assistance. Higher education was of little help, however, in formulating the major national policy goals in health care, economic development, and community change. The ability of

*The names and titles of speakers are indicated in the programs, appendix B. The keynote speeches are scheduled for publication in the fall 1974 issue of *Educational Record*.

**President Marvin Wachman, Temple University; President Warren Bennis, University of Cincinnati; President William McInnes, University of San Francisco; President Granville Sawyer, Texas Southern University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

colleges and universities to emulate the agricultural model of the land grant institutions in goal setting and problem solving was missing. In part, the deficiency was due to the accelerated rate of change that indicated higher education warning systems and response mechanisms were inadequate (Wachman).

Many of the urban problems of the 1960s were magnified because urban universities were very close to the total range of urban delivery systems—medical, communication, social work, education, recreation, and culture. Nevertheless, few, if any, colleges and universities had developed a systematic procedure for relating to society's problems, aspirations, and service delivery systems (Wachman).

One keynote speaker suggested looking at the city as a series of processes that comprise the major forces of the urban community (Sawyer). He identified the forces as the physical city, the human city, the political city, and the ideational city. Viewed in isolation, such forces present a misleading picture of urban life, but viewed as subsystems within the urban environment, they help explain the complexities and conflicts so common to American cities in the 1970s.

Some conclusions to be drawn from the keynote speeches are as follows:

- Urban involvement cannot happen automatically. It must be deliberately designed, seriously committed, and sophisticatedly implemented.
- Colleges and universities must loosen the rigidities of their reward systems.
- Colleges and universities must develop advisory panels composed of non-university based practitioners to assist in the development of mid-career educational programs and universities.
- Colleges and universities must equip urban career-oriented students with professional skills and competence for leadership responsibilities in city governance, while also preparing non-professional students with socio-personal skills for coping with everyday pressures of urban life.
- Urban programs must be comprehensive enough to accommodate the dimensions of all relationships in the urban community.
- Higher education institutions must actively sell themselves to the public.
- Higher education student bodies, administrative offices, and faculty must become more representative of the diverse ethnic and racial groups in metropolitan areas.

The Federal Government Views

The Federal government views were presented by luncheon speakers at each conference and by panels on the topic, "Opportunities for College and University Involvement in Federal Urban Programs: Problems and Prospects."* The chairmen of the Federal regional offices designated senior officials from Federal agencies in their region to make panel presentations on Federal programs of interest to colleges and universities. Federal agencies were represented at the four regional conferences as follows: Department of Housing and Urban Development at Washington, San Francisco, Chicago, New Orleans; Department of Labor in Washington, Chicago, New Orleans; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Washington, Chicago; Office of Economic Opportunity in San Francisco; Small Business Administration in Chicago; Department of Transportation in Chicago, New Orleans; Environmental Protection Agency in New Orleans; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, San Francisco, Chicago, New Orleans.

In addition to the agencies represented, other programs were discussed in several panel sessions. Among these were the programs of ACTION, National Institute of Health, National Science Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Representation from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Education was sought, but these agencies declined to participate.

Each Federal agency representative outlined the major programs the agency administered that were of interest to colleges and universities. Programs included research grants, program evaluation analysis, curriculum development grants, specialized training programs (vocational, rehabilitation, and paraprofessional), work-study programs, federal agency internships, student assistance, funds for developing institutions and medical schools, and programs that fostered the recruitment of minority students.

Most of the Federal agency representatives were pleased with the relationships their agencies had developed with colleges and universities in their regions and endorsed the concept of the urban involvement of higher education. The major obstacles encountered in the past were cited as follows:

- Federal agencies have not always clearly articulated to colleges and universities which programs the federal agencies deem to be of greatest importance.
- Colleges and universities require much longer lead times than most government agencies to plan, implement, and evaluate a program.
- New approaches must be developed to bring college and university researchers closer to decision-makers in the public arena.
- Colleges and universities have not been as far-sighted as some other institutions in reorganizing themselves to meet changing conditions, particularly in administration, departmentalization, and reward systems.

*The speakers were Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Michael Moskow, Assistant Secretary, Housing and Urban Development; Norman Erbe, Chairman, Federal Regional Council, Region V; and Ernest Woods, Staff Director, Southwest Regional Council.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

• Some Federal administrators have a distrust of academics and academic institutions.

Impact of New Federalism

The one idea that the Federal agency representatives commented upon at all four conferences was the impact of the New Federalism on the decision-making process in American government. The New Federalism became a reality in 1972 when Congress provided funds to complement the structural changes already taking place throughout the Federal system. The key features of the New Federalism are revenue sharing, regionalism, reorganization, and innovation.

Revenue sharing has been discussed in a variety of ways for the past twelve years. In 1972, Congress passed a General Revenue Sharing Bill which provided $30 billion to states and localities over the next five years. Special revenue sharing, which was designated to replace the categorical grant-in-aid programs, has met stiff resistance in Congress and to date only two of the four major bills (law enforcement, education, manpower, and community development) have been passed. The current problem facing states and localities is that without special revenue sharing, there are insufficient funds to continue grant programs. General revenue sharing was designed to provide additional monies for States and localities.

Regionalism has been implemented by the establishment of ten Federal Regional Councils (FRC) around the country. The FRCs are designed to forge a closer working relationship between the Federal government and local, county, State, and higher education personnel. They are charged with sharing management and planning functions and techniques with State and local officials and offering technical assistance in any way possible to upgrade the quality of subnational program development, administration, and evaluation.

Reorganization concerns chiefly the administrative decentralization that has occured in many Federal agencies. A number of Federal agencies have gone further than decentralizing administrative authority to their ten regional offices. Some, like the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, have begun to increase the number of field offices. Such administrative decentralization is designed to provide flexible responses to local problems. With Federal offices much closer to local governments, it is anticipated that grants, inquiries, and problems can be processed much faster, thereby increasing the capacity of local public officials to make decisions quickly.

Innovation refers to several new program ideas attempted by different departments to help reduce the lead times, paper work, and duplication in the Federal grant process. Some of the programs are:

• Planned variations that attempt to circumvent the current categorical grant-in-aid program. The program seeks to augment the power of the mayor by giving him authority to modify or waive certain Federal regulations. It also enables the mayor greatly to influence the allocation of federal money coming into his city by giving him the power to review and comment on all programs affecting his city.

• Annual arrangements originated in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is designed to circumvent some of the weaknesses of the grant-in-aid system. The mayor and HUD officials sign a contract for a specified amount of dollars. The mayor is effectively in charge of all HUD programs in his city and must draft a comprehensive city-wide development strategy, agreed to by HUD officials.

The message to the higher education community is clear. Colleges and universities should no longer look entirely to Washington for funding, ideas, and assistance and should begin developing strong relationships with city, county, and State government officials to whom new authority is being devolved. Higher education has developed strong relationships with public officials at the national level. If the New Federalism continues to develop, college and university administrators will find themselves turning more and more to State and local governmental officials for much of the funding they have come to expect from the Federal government.

Several conference participants from predominantly minority institutions voiced concern that this was a step backward for them. They have spent years trying to build bridges to the appropriate Federal agencies in order to circumvent discriminatory practices of local and State governments. To such members, the New Federalism means establishing new ties with government agencies that have not treated them equitably in the past. They feel that the Federal government is the only level where they can receive the necessary assistance and funding to ensure a realistic opportunity to grow and develop in an increasingly competitive higher education market. Clearly, New Federalism is not universally accepted, nor have all of its components been fully implemented.

Several speakers focused on new directions in funding urban programs.

• A major point raised by two speakers was the shift in emphasis from funding institutions to funding students. The Basic Opportunity Grants are budgeted for over $1 billion, and all of the speakers felt this program would ensure that any qualified student will now have an equal opportunity to attend the college or university of his or her choice (Weinberger, Erbe).

• An integral part of the university's function is urban, but only a part. Colleges and universities must utilize their resources and abilities to the fullest in urban endeavors, but they must also recognize they cannot substitute for government or social welfare agencies (Weinberger).

• The new budget requests for higher education seek a better match between the diverse nature of the student population and the capacity of higher education institutions to prepare the students for the realities of contemporary society. Technical education should have liberal arts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

components and vice versa. Colleges and universities should take steps to end the traditional separation between academic and vocational studies. Many of these changes are already taking place at the community college level (Erbe).

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development representative (Moskow) delineated several new or expanded programs where universities and colleges might get involved, including opportunities offered by the transfer of the Urban Observatory Program to ten new cities with populations under 250,000; by support for doctoral dissertation research in selected housing and urban studies areas; and by the Urban Information Systems Interagency Committee (USAC), which is making greater use of computer technology in urban communication and information programs in five test cities.

Comment

The Federal agency representatives were on the program to contribute to some of the major objectives of the conferences, namely, to examine how colleges and universities might increase their participation in Federally funded urban programs, to encourage such involvement, and to provide specific information about Federal urban programs of interest to colleges and universities. Those purposes were not fully accomplished. Without exception the speakers and panelists from Federal agencies endorsed the concept of the urban involvement of higher education, solicited the cooperation of colleges and universities in appropriate programs, and expressed optimism about future prospects. The Federal representatives, though, did not give much specific information or have a real basis for encouragement. Perhaps this outcome is inevitable in the current period of transition. Many of the categorical grant programs have been discontinued, frozen, or impounded, and special revenue sharing programs are not yet operative. Administrative decentralization—transferring major authority to the regional offices—is not yet applicable to all Federal agencies and is unevenly administered where it is applicable. Furthermore, the Federal establishment does not have a consistent policy regarding the participation of colleges and universities in Federally funded urban programs.

The Federal representatives consequently found themselves, despite their good intent, without a firm basis for advising colleges and universities about the opportunities and prospects for participating in urban programs. The presentations and discussions created in all of the conferences an atmosphere of discouragement and disenchantment about the effective involvement of higher education in federally funded programs related to urban affairs.

State and Local Government Views

The mayors of the host cities or their representatives welcomed the conference participants and discussed some of the cooperative programs currently being undertaken by city government and the local colleges and universities.

Two of the mayors, Richard Daley of Chicago and Walter Washington of Washington, applauded the past efforts of colleges and universities and urged them to increase their involvement in the years ahead. Several points raised by the mayors' introductory remarks were:

- Colleges and universities must make education more relevant, and this process should be started early in the educational career.
- Educators must think in terms of treating the whole person and preparing him for life in a predominantly urban society.
- Colleges and universities must think in terms of making total institutional commitments if their urban involvement is to have a chance of succeeding.

At each conference a panel was presented on *How States and Local Communities can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems.* The panels were composed of public officials representing the six major public interest groups involved in urban programs. Represented were the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Governors Conference, the Council of State Governments, the National Association of Counties, and the International City Management Association.

The panelists, without exception, endorsed the idea of cooperation between local government and academe and welcomed the cooperation of colleges and universities in urban programs. Each city government representative spoke of his own experiences in trying to build stronger relationships with colleges and universities.

There was general agreement on the major obstacles to strengthening college and university relationships with state and local governments:

- The difficulty of clearly defining what constitutes executive leadership and commitment both in higher education and in local government; and of transmitting that commitment through a hierarchical organization.
- The departmentalization of colleges, universities, and local governments that impedes the development of institutional coordination and hence commitment.
- The inadequacy of communication channels between academics and local officials. Institutionally it is extremely difficult to determine if contact should be maintained by executives, department heads, liaison officers, task forces, and coordinating committees, or in a spontaneous way by all of the above. In a substantive sense there are severe communications problems. Public officials often cannot understand what academics are talking about when they propose research programs. Conversely, academics often do not understand the sense of urgency that public officials convey when trying to describe a problem which requires some research attention.
- The longer times required by academics to develop, conduct, and transmit research in which they are engaged. Frequently local governments need answers to problems in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a relatively short period of time, but college and university faculty are not geared either by training or experience to produce sound research on a prescribed schedule.

- The nature of the reward system inherent in both academic and local governments. Colleges and universities still pay the greatest rewards to faculty for publishing, teaching excellence, and university service, but very few colleges and universities reward faculties for service to the community on a par with the other three criteria. Local governments also do not reward their employees for working on projects with college faculty. Employees in both sectors can be penalized when it comes time for promotion or when supervisors prepare periodic evaluations of their employees. Without appropriate incentives in both the academic and governmental communities, an improved relationship between the two will be extremely difficult to achieve.
- Mutual skepticism. Local governments view academia often as a bastion of radicalism in their environment. Ivory tower professors and idealistic, middle class students who think of themselves as consultants and saviors are not likely to endear themselves to local public officials. Conversely, public officials who think only of their immediate problems and who try to tell faculty what they should be teaching their students are viewed as invaders on the campus, not as potential contributors to the academic program (Sipel).

While these obstacles present many problems in developing enduring relationships between higher education and state and local governments, many panelists offered comments and suggestions concerning what they have seen in the past and what they would like to see more of in the future to enhance this relationship. The following major points were raised by the panelists:

- University faculty should spend more time working in local governmental agencies, and local public officials should spend more time offering seminars or courses at colleges (Poggenburg).
- Colleges and local governments must resolve both the rhetorical and the practical misconceptions concerning the difference between education and training and how these terms apply to pre-entry and mid-career students (Poggenburg).
- Practitioners in local government should serve in an advisory capacity on curriculum development projects (Stinnett, Benninghoven).
- Colleges and universities should coordinate their placement activities with local governments.
- The urban observatory idea has a great deal of merit and should be initiated—with or without Federal funding—in many more cities across the country.
- The quantity and the quality of internship programs in local government needs to be increased; this requires better cooperation than presently exists (Sipel).
- Local governments should make it easier for faculty to attend staff meetings, planning sessions, legislation drafting meetings, and policy-making sessions (Blick).
- Local colleges and universities should prepare directories of faculty members' interests and competencies. The directories should be sent to all local governments in the area (Blick).
- A better understanding is needed by all concerned that local government has a greater impact upon the lives of most citizens than does the Federal government.
- The six public interest groups should begin to develop a greater awareness among their members of programs that will increase cooperation between local governments and colleges and universities.

Foundation Representatives

General sessions on how foundations have aided colleges and universities were scheduled at three of the conferences. The San Francisco conference devoted its session to the role of the business community in higher education programs.

The Washington and New Orleans conferences scheduled only one speaker, a representative of the Ford Foundation. The general session in Chicago featured three speakers, only one of whom directly represented a foundation.

The Ford Foundation representative summarized the experience of the foundation over the past fifteen years in funding a variety of urban programs on college and university campuses. The foundation's efforts have taken place in two distinct time periods and with two completely different thrusts. The first attempt, which took place in the late 1950s and early 1960s, was designed to replicate the experience of the nineteenth century agricultural extension agents. The experiment had mixed results at best. In some cases the programs were well funded and ably directed, and they produced some lasting results. In other cases the experiments failed, and no trace of their efforts remains today.

The Ford Foundation representative urged the colleges and universities to continue to experiment and innovate in ways they know best to alleviate urban ills. But he cautioned the participants to plan carefully, provide capable leadership, incorporate rigorous analysis, apply their research findings, and beware of the pitfalls in all of the above.

The Ford Foundation representative presented a rather discouraging picture of the foundation's future in higher education urban programs, stating that, "The substantial investment I have been talking about combined with shrinking budgets projected for the next few years leaves no room in the foreseeable future for continued experiments or a third major urban thrust. We probably will take an evaluative look at the recent series of grants but unfortunately no new initiatives are in prospect."

The other presentation by a foundation representative was made at the Chicago conference by a representative

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of the Chicago Community Trust. She urged the participants to remember that foundations cannot be easily typed. They vary tremendously in such factors as size of endowment, source of contributions, degree of independence in making grants, scope of objectives, geographical domain, size of staff, and ideology of administrators. In short, foundations differ considerably from one another, and there are many more in existence than most colleges and universities know (Adrienne Y. Bailey, Program Associate).

One type of foundation of particular relevance to urban-oriented colleges and universities is the community foundation. Its grants are made to benefit a specific geographical area. In most cases the community foundation distributes the annual income, less administrative expenses, to local agencies and institutions for a wide range of activities. Examples of such foundations can be found in Chicago, New York, Boston, and Cleveland. (Bailey)

Representatives from the Business Community

Representatives from the business community were on panels at the conferences in San Francisco and Chicago. In addition, speakers discussing the role of business in an urban society made presentations at the San Francisco conference. Two different approaches were taken on the relationship of the corporation to the university and the steps colleges and universities should take to strengthen this relationship. The second approach focused on business with respect to soceity as a whole, emphasizing metropolitan areas particularly.

The following conclusions were derived from the presentations on corporation-university relationships:

- Colleges and universities have not utilized the full resources of the business community. Viewing corporations solely as contributors, they have neglected such resources as executive talent and management techniques.
- Colleges and universities have not done an objective job of presenting the corporation to students as an important institution in society.
- Corporations, even though they are affected by inflation, could be persuaded to contribute more to higher education. Few corporations make full use of the 5 percent pre-tax profit allowance for contributions.
- Colleges and universities should develop specific avenues for corporate giving. Corporations are becoming more and more wary of giving to the university general fund: They want to see where their dollars go, and what results are obtained. (MacGregor).

The movement for social responsibility is not directed solely at business corporations today. Where once society expected business only to be economically responsible, it now demands that business accept a social responsibility as well. Similarly, society today expects colleges and universities to play an active and direct role in urban life. In other words business and higher education are involved in urban problems together because society demands it of them.

Colleges and universities play their roles in urban involvement by training the young, producing socially relevant research, interpreting and analyzing information, providing channels of communication, and serving as a conduit for upward mobility in our society, especially for minorities. Business has a major role to play in assisting colleges and universities to accomplish these tasks by donating, loaning, or granting money, by encouraging new program development, and imparting the latest information on management and budget techniques. If the strengths of two such important institutions of society can be marshalled to achieve stated objectives, then society as a whole will be the beneficiary.

Needed Changes for Colleges and Universities to Enhance their Urban Involvement

Each conference concluded with a panel on needed changes in colleges and universities that would enhance their urban involvement. The major changes recommended by panelists were:

- A climate for internal change must be developed within the colleges and universities. The institutions must become more flexible if they are to keep current with the rapidly changing pace of life in urban areas.
- Colleges and universities must strike a more even balance between pure and applied research. Higher education research must be made more relevant to the needs of urban residents.
- There must be a clear definition of each school's urban mission. It should be realistic and premised on a careful assessment of the institution's existing and projected resources. This in turn will permit a more qualitative selection of projects to be initiated.
- Colleges and universities should involve minorities more in all levels of academic activities. The participation of minority students, faculty, and administrators will help to increase the credibility of higher education institutions in the urban community.
- Colleges and universities should become less conservative in the types of urban programs they initiate. By taking more risks, colleges and universities may reap greater satisfaction and rewards from their urban program efforts.
- Colleges and universities must increase nontraditional learning experiences for students. Such activities include internships, field research, participant observation, work-study programs, specialized institutes and seminars, and field trips.
- Colleges and universities must find ways to stimulate more faculty to become involved in urban oriented programs. The most direct approach would be a restructuring of the university reward system to induce greater participation, while eliminating the fear that such involvement might, in effect, penalize participating faculty members.

3 Opportunities for the Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities

Major purposes of the conferences were to examine how higher education has met urban needs, to delineate problems encountered by urban colleges and universities, and to project needed future developments in urban involvement. These purposes were accomplished by considering, in a number of concurrent sessions, a wide range of institutional urban programs. The presentors were requested to describe current programs and to indicate problems and future prospects.

It was recognized at the outset that only a small proportion of the literally hundreds of urban-related programs of colleges and universities could be covered, and no attempt was made to cover all aspects of the urban involvement of higher education. We believe, though, that the following sampling of outstanding programs will be revealing to Federal, State, and local government agencies and helpful to colleges and universities seeking ways to enhance their urban-related efforts.

This chapter summarizes the papers and discussions of the concurrent panels held at each conference. It should be noted that the local executive committees developed panel topics according to the interests of the schools in the several regions and that, consequently, the programs differed in each of the conferences. Papers of the concurrent sessions were not distributed at the conferences; persons interested in specific papers should contact appropriate panel members whose names and titles are indicated in the programs, appendix B. Listed below are the titles of the concurrent panel sessions and the conference where they were presented.

1. Applied Social Research (Washington, San Francisco, Chicago, New Orleans)
2. Application of Science and Technology to Urban Problems (Washington)
3. Continuing Education and Community Service (Washington, San Francisco)
4. University Relationships to Minority Communities (Washington, San Francisco)
5. Organization and Administration for Urban Programs: Interinstitutional Cooperation (Washington, San Francisco, New Orleans)
6. Urban Instructional Programs (Washington)
7. Faculty Involvement (San Francisco)
8. Planning (San Francisco)
9. Urban Public Universities (Chicago)
10. Community and Junior Colleges (Chicago)
11. Nontraditional Learning Systems (Chicago)
12. Professional Institutions (Chicago)
13. State-Based Programs (New Orleans)
14. Mid-Career Training (New Orleans)
15. Voluntarism (New Orleans)

Applied Social Research

The panels on applied urban research focused on specific programs at colleges and universities in order to highlight the problems and successes of applied research efforts.

The Center for Urban Affairs at Morgan State College has six major components, most of which are engaged in applied urban research activities. The six programs are: Urban Studies and Community Service, Urban Planning and Policy Analysis, Center for the Study of the Behavior of Urban Youth, Small Business Institute, Cooperative Education Centers administered jointly with the Baltimore Public Schools, and a master's level program for teachers in urban schools (Franklin).

The Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research at The Johns Hopkins University has as its primary function producing research studies for local government. The center brings together researchers whose main interest is applied urban research, and it provides a career opportunity for people who want to solve real world problems. The main problems facing the center are its lack of control over recruitment and promotion of faculty members who are attached to specific teaching disciplines and the difficulty in obtaining local funding for applied urban research projects (Crain and Fisher).

Northwestern University's Center for Urban Affairs has developed a program called the Community Service Voucher Project, funded by the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Community groups submit statements of need to the center, which awards vouchers worth $10,000 each to four community groups. The vouchers are redeemable in research services at the university, although both the university and the community group must agree that the project will be mutually beneficial. Each party has veto power over the project (Massotti).

The Milwaukee Urban Observatory program is one of ten federally funded observatories around the country. Several models for organizing observatory programs cur-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rently exist, such as units of the university, or agencies or offices of local government or nonprofit corporations. Participants were cautioned not to accept the observatory model as one that can be automatically adopted by other institutions. The Milwaukee experience has indicated that academics are not generally interested in cooperative research and lack an awareness of government interests (Irwin).

The University of California at Berkeley experience was discussed in light of its Oakland Project. Berkeley utilized graduate students in the mayor's office, the personnel office, the finance office, and with the chief of police. Students conducted research and sat in on policy development meetings. Both the university and the city benefited from the program (Lee).

The discussion periods following the panel presentations centered on the following points:

- College professors as a group are opposed to applied urban research because it threatens what they regard as the purity of academia.
- Some sectors of local government have little understanding of and consequently little commitment to the research and development function.
- Colleges and universities lack mechanisms for identifying research needs and making appropriate responses.
- Colleges and universities should not be blamed for failures to provide solutions. They can only present evidence.
- Colleges and universities should make applied urban research a top priority. They should also learn to put research findings into nontechnical terms.
- Academics tend to denigrate short-term research requested by local governments. Colleges and universities should learn to understand consumers (local governments) better.

Application of Science and Technology to Urban Problems

The first panelist discussed the Fire Protection Engineering Program at the University of Maryland. This program has been developed on the premise that a more intensive professional education and training curriculum for fire service personnel will improve fire protection. Students are offered courses in engineering, mathematics, physics and an array of electives (Hickey).

The second panelist was a representative of the Carnegie-Mellon University, School of Urban and Public Affairs. His presentation focused on the Physical/Technical Systems Project Course: A Way of Linking Technology with Urban Management. The course is designed for first-year students in master's programs who want to apply some of their technological backgrounds to urban problems. Situations are usually selected from problems experienced by nearby local governments. Public officials and university personnel discuss the issues and the research goals until both are satisfied with the objectives of the project. Students organize themselves into groups, develop a research design, conduct the research, and prepare a final report for both the professor and the client agency (Walters).

Much of the panel's follow-up discussion centered on knowledge and selection of topics to be researched as well as on the limitations of the university. The limitations were discussed in terms of time, faculty resources, and pressure upon students who have other courses to complete.

Continuing Education and Community Service

Tulane University developed a program called World Game Theory in which students lived in different parts of the metropolitan area. They returned to school and assumed roles that permitted each student to learn something about community life from others.

At Federal City College in Washington, D.C., there are a variety of community-oriented and continuing education programs. Some of these programs are the Experimental Programs Office, the Institute of Gerontology, Department of Labor Education, Public Affairs Forum, Community Planning and Development, Extension Services, Speech and Hearing Clinic, and New Careers Program. The programs at FCC are founded in the belief that urban higher education institutions should develop new programs to meet grass roots needs and that participation by those who live and work in the city is essential. Furthermore, such community-oriented programs must be continuously evaluated and modified (Blake).

Another paper focused on the experience of the University of Pittsburgh when it tried to expand its facilities to a neighboring community in the late 1960s. Colleges and universities are always suspect when they attempt such expansions, because in the past they have been involved in land speculation and have occasionally been slumlords. Launching a successful community program might include some or all of the following: listening, mediation, planning, sharing information, mutual education, and mutual respect (McFadden).

The major issues confronting communities in urban areas today are environmental protection, decreasing local revenue bases, and emerging alternative life styles. Colleges and universities are deeply involved in all three of these issues as they affect communities. The issues require that higher education administrators treat community residents in a collaborative rather than a combative manner. Planning with community residents is the wave of the future, and colleges and universities should begin thinking about joint college-community planning bodies (Fink).

Discussion sessions following the presentation of papers emphasized five points:

- Teaching, research, and public service must be viewed as interrelated functions by higher education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Community service should be considered as encompassing the whole metropolitan area, since changes in one section will lead to changes in others.
- Community service and continuing education programs should be developed so they do not threaten other academic program areas. Conflicts should be minimized while cooperation is maximized. Interdisciplinary approaches should be the goal.
- The market for continuing education is growing, and it is certain that this area will become an increasingly important component of the college or university academic program.
- Community service programs sometimes suffer from the changing nature of political leadership in urban areas. Another problem area is the potential conflict of interest that colleges and universities face in areas where they own extensive property.

University Relationships to Minority Communities

Livingston College, a part of Rutgers University, was founded to assist the black and Puerto Rican communities in New Jersey, which now account for around 30 percent of the college's enrollment. The college has developed some successful programs, such as community internships and the University Year in Action. Many programs, however, have failed, and the college leadership is constantly being called upon to justify its role. As a result, Livingston has developed a poor reputation with the state legislature, which is responsible for funding (Hartmen).

At the University of Pennsylvania, the decade-old Human Resources Center seeks to bring the resources of the university to bear on problems outside of its walls. This is done through intervention strategies based upon mutual determination of goals by the University and the client community. In 1968, the center became part of the Department of City and Regional Planning in the Graduate School of Fine Arts and began to distinguish clearly between action research and community action (Mitchell).

San Francisco State University has developed a School of Ethnic Studies where students can take courses in Asian American Studies, Black Studies, LA RAZA Studies, and Native American Studies. The school attempts to provide students with an understanding of peoples who have unique experiences in our society. The school is committed to the concept of pluralism in American life and views ethnic differences as a means of conveying this to students (Hirabayashi).

The discussion sessions raised the following points:

- Appointment and promotion policies at colleges and universities are still based upon traditional criteria, and this reduces the incentive for community work by faculty members.
- College and university faculty and administrators must constantly be reminded to think of local communities as a laboratory.
- University representatives who interact with minority communities must be carefully selected.
- University commitments to minority communities will be tested now that the pressures generated by urban riots have diminished.
- Many white colleges and universities have failed to utilize successful models of university-community relations developed by black colleges and universities.

University Organization and Administration of Urban Programs: Interinstitutional Cooperation

The presentations in these panels focused more on interinstitutional than intrainstitutional organization and administration.

The Higher Education Center for Urban Studies (HECUS) in Bridgeport is a consortium of nine public and private colleges and universities in southern Connecticut. About 18,000 students are enrolled in the schools, and 80 percent of them are commuters. HECUS, a voluntary organization which serves member schools as an instrument, has a theme of cooperation and collaboration, and the key to its success has been its flexibility.

HECUS assists member institutions to help community groups to study, plan, organize, implement, and finance efforts to understand and resolve community and regional problems. HECUS opens channels to members, institutions for minority groups, elderly, women, and other special groups seeking education services. It also opens channels to the community for faculty and students seeking opportunities to study and work in community settings. Some of the successful programs developed by HECUS are Joint Education Program, Health Services, Veteran Affairs, and Research and Training efforts (Lansdale).

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) comprises the thirteen western states and has as its primary concern the problems of delivery of educational services and scarce educational resources to sparsely populated areas. The characteristics which make such a collaborative effort successful are: 1) significant problems are identified; 2) strong support is obtained from those factions that will be most affected; 3) participating organizations feel they are getting as much as they are giving; 4) participants are willing to contribute time and energy; 5) advising and policymaking functions are performed by people who can see the whole picture; 6) progress is made by consensus; 7) sufficient unrestricted funds are available to support the project; and 8) staff is of high quality (Kroepsch).

The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education is a voluntary consortium for a single metropolitan area and includes both urban and nonurban institutions. The staff of the consortium has developed a close working relationship with faculty and administrators at all member institutions. The major forms of interinstitutional cooperations performed by the consortium are those of informa-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tion broker to the community, and to the member colleges and universities, teaching agency, providor of facilities, service agency which coordinates task forces, implements talent search, and sponsors service centers, and educational change agent (Averill).

The New Orleans Consortium, begun in 1968, unites three local universities in a variety of programs, some of which are cross registrations, faculty interchanges, development of a major in social work, a small business program, and a community mental health counseling team.

The discussion sessions raised the following points:

- Consortia can become easily overloaded and neglect some vital teaching and research functions.
- Consortia should identify people on different member campuses who have skills and are available to help in community projects.
- Projects should be selected by committees composed of academic and community people who determine which projects are valid and have priorities.
- Traditional reward systems impede full realization of consortium goals.
- Funding of consortium projects can be a problem, since member schools feel that approaches to local sources will compete with their own fund raising activities.

Urban Instructional Programs

The American University requires that every full-time student, undergraduate and graduate, majoring in urban affairs serve one-half of one semester in an urban internship. The internships are carefully arranged, closely supervised, and thoroughly evaluated by students, faculty, and public officials. Students have an opportunity to supplement theory with practical experiences and to develop and grow personally. They are also challenged to clarify individual career goals. The university benefits by both providing an alternative learning experience and building new bridges to public and private agencies in the area. The host agency benefits by being able to undertake new projects, recruit qualified interns at a later date for permanent staff positions, and provide an infusion of new ideas into the agency. A weekly seminar for all items helps students relate theory to practical experiences (Zauderer).

The University of Massachusetts at Boston's College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) was established in 1973. The college was designed to offer preprofessional and liberal arts training; however, the program was based not upon course credits, but rather around a certificate system with field experience as an integral component. In order for students to graduate, they must complete ten certificates of competency. Presently the college in seven curriculum centers offers twelve different certificates in Essential Skills (writing, speaking, reading, and math), Housing and Community Development, Institutions (policy and economic change), Individual and Society (communications), and Cultural Studies. Each certificate program has an evaluation team composed of at least two persons, one of whom is not a member of that curriculum center (Strange).

The Washington Semester Program, begun at American University almost thirty years ago, today has been expanded to include three Washington semesters, an urban semester, an economic policy semester and a foreign policy semester. More than 140 participating colleges and universities send some of their students to Washington each year to study in one of the semester programs. The objective is to take advantage of the Washington setting as a laboratory in which to study the governmental process. Students have seminars with congressmen, lobbyists, administrators, and staff personnel who help shape domestic and foreign policy. Students also develop and carry out a semester-long research project, and most of them also serve as interns in a governmental agency one day per week (Brown).

Highlights of the discussion session were as follows:

- Competency is difficult to measure at any point in the education process. Student progress is difficult to evaluate.
- Without careful preplanning, internships can get mired in the exaggerated expectations of students and host agencies as to what each is going to receive from the experience.
- Competency-based programs often look to local agencies to help develop the competency requirements. This in turn may encourage the agencies to send their employees into the program.
- All such programs require the support and commitment of university administrators, including adequate incentives for faculty to get involved.

Faculty Involvement

The panel on faculty involvement focused on the problems of creating interdisciplinary institutional relationships. Problems inherent in traditional university organization and reward systems were discussed (Marini). Current models of interdisciplinary programs were examined with emphasis on some of the obstacles that have to be surmounted, such as administrative commitment, the financing of new academic ideas, careful recruitment of faculty, and territoriality of individual departments (Kerrigan).

The following issues were raised at the discussion session:

- There are many personal, financial, and institutional obstacles to the development of interdisciplinary programs aimed at urban problems solving.
- College and university organizational structures must be drastically changed before a major faculty effort will be made in the urban area.

Planning

The panel on planning was devoted to a discussion of some of the basic concepts of planning and how they could be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

applied to enhancing the university's role in urban affairs. None of the panelists presented formal papers. Each made brief introductory statements, and then all members of the audience were invited to participate through questions or discussion. Common experiences were found in three areas.

- Planning is not merely a technical process but should become the vehicle for closer cooperation between the university and the community.
- Planning should be viewed as a mechanism to open up dialogues, increase alternatives, and take into account political and economic conditons.
- Planning should be a continuous process that is cognizant of both internal and external pressures.

Urban Public Universities

No formal papers were presented during this panel in order that panelists could discuss their programs and hold a general discussion.

The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee was established as a response to the educational needs of returning veterans of World War II. It is the only public institution in Milwaukee, and this places a heavy responsibility on its programming.

The University of Illinois at Chicago Circle is one of several state institutions in the city. Each institution develops its own areas of specialization, and—even though there is no formal coordination—each school avoids duplicating what the others are doing.

The University of Massachusetts at Boston was created with a mandate to educate the poor and to provide a quality academic program as well. The mandate created administrative and faculty conflicts, most of which have been overcome by the creation of separate colleges within the university to cater to different student needs.

The most important characteristic that differentiates the three schools from the main campuses is the student body. The students are primarily first generation college students who come from lower-middle or lower-income families. Each of the schools believes that experimentation with nontraditional approaches to education will help bridge the gap between school and community. This approach is evidenced in both the classroom and in the applied social research projects undertaken by students and faculty.

The discussions raised the following points:

- The mission of the urban university should be to educate an urban clientele, to conduct both pure and applied research, and to serve the community.
- Opportunities should be provided for both students and faculty to go out into the community and observe problems firsthand.
- Experimentation in educational programs cannot be performed *on* the neighboring community; it must be conducted *with* the community.
- Student populations at urban public universities may be the mechanism for bridging the gap between university and community.
- Public universities should be educating students to understand and solve urban problems rather than trying as universities to solve the problems.

Community and Junior Colleges

The Miami-Dade Community College is located on three campuses and four centers and also provides direct services to residents at 317 other locations in the metropolitan area. Miami-Dade tries to ensure equal access by waiving fees for any student whose family qualifies for federal assistance. In addition, there is a scholarship program, a loan program, and many work opportunities. The college conducts a vigorous advertising campaign to apprise the residents of all of the educational opportunities available to them. Some of the programs currently being offered include the Institute for Criminal Justice, a prison program, allied health programs at both Mount Sinai Hospital and the Jackson Hospital Center, and a Day Care Center for mothers on Welfare (Masiko).

The City Colleges of Chicago offer 212 career programs in business, creative and performing arts, engineering, health services, and public and human services. They are attempting to fulfill the functions of community colleges that are rooted in the community—career programs, continuing studies, and community services. Presently, 31,000 students are enrolled in adult education courses in the system, and more than 20,000 are engaged in the Adult Learning Skills Program (Shabat).

Highlights of the discussion period were:

- Junior colleges should stop aspiring to be senior or four-year colleges and should strive to become true community colleges.
- The concept of the community college is not yet clearly defined. It should provide services and benefits to all segments of the adult population and must be built around the wants and needs of the adults in the community.
- Community colleges should provide educational services to a wide spectrum of adults in accordance with the experiential background of the student in accessible locations and at convenient times.

Nontraditional Learning Systems

This panel presented a paper and commentary on it by the other panelists. Afterwards, the floor was open for discussion.

The Minnesota Metropolitan State College (MMSC) draws its students from the twin cities and from each of the seven counties in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. The average student is 34 years old, holds a full-time job, and has extensive commitments to family or community. All students have either ninety quarter-credits or have demonstrated the equivalent credit in verified competencies gained in noncollege settings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The underlying principle of the college is that all learning systems must be flexible and adaptable to the student's needs. It offers the student the opportunity to design his own learning program and to assume the major responsibility for implementing it. Students are encouraged to combine the study of the theoretical with the practical and to achieve a demonstrated competence by viewing learning as the achievement of skills. Finally MMSC offers the student the opportunity to develop an understanding of the learning process, because he has set his own goals and pursued them in a systematic way (Sweet).

Basic points raised by the other panelists and the audience were as follows:

- Most established institutions cannot revolutionize their programs because they must comply with state and local requirements or academic tradition.
- It is doubtful that either the minority group student from the inner-city educational system or the bright, motivated suburban student will benefit from this program.
- MMSC and schools like it might prove to be testing grounds for experimental programs that later can be introduced into more traditional institutions.
- It is not clear that graduates of MMSC meet the expectations of the outside world as to what a college graduate should be able to do.

Professional Institutions

The purpose of this panel was to examine the role of professional schools in the urban involvement of higher education. The only presented paper discussed the University of Illinois Medical Center in Chicago. This is one of the world's largest medical centers and is located in downtown Chicago. The campus includes the Colleges of Dentistry, Medicare, Nursing and Pharmacy, the Graduate College, the School of Public Health, the School of Associated Medical Sciences, and the University of Illinois Hospital. The presenter outlined several programs established to meet specific urban needs in the areas of teaching, research, and service and also discussed problems involved in the continued development of branch clinical schools of medicine in Rockford and Peoria, Illinois (Diekma).

Other panelists discussed the Urban Journalism Center at Northwestern University and the Woodlawn Criminal Defense Service Project of the University of Chicago.

The discussion period raised the following issues:

- Universities cannot provide all the necessary services to a community, but they can provide new models for a community to improve aspects of urban life.
- Certain community service projects have dividends in teaching and research. Universities should seek those projects in which the objectives of education and research are met.
- When colleges and universities enter the community their desire for concrete outcomes may limit the scope of the institutions action.

State-Based Programs

No papers were presented in this panel session. Panelists and participants engaged in a discussion of state-based programs in the humanities.

The purpose of state-based programs is to bring together the academic community, especially professors in the humanities, with the adult nonschool public to discuss public policymaking and decision-making.

The major problems encountered in these programs are:

- Most people are not aware that such programs exist and that funds are available.
- There is difficulty in selecting academics who can communicate with the community in a meaningful way.
- Academics are not always interested in community-oriented programs. They often prefer to obtain grants to conduct research closer to their personal interests.

Mid-Career Training

The two papers presented on this panel and the following discussion focused on similar questions. The presentations and the discussion segment, therefore, are presented together.

The mid-career student market has some basic characteristics: 1) students usually have undergraduate degrees, and some have graduate degrees; 2) many have been working for a decade or more; 3) the students are in the 35-45 age bracket; 4) many have responsible middle-management positions in their organizations; and 5) a high percentage belong to a professional organization.

The two approaches to the mid-career market are training and education. Training would overcome professional obsolescence by updating techniques and knowledge of the mid-career practitioner. Education involves dealing with changes resulting from the assumption of new managerial responsibilities, thus requiring new skills and new outlooks. The training function will probably be easier to meet than the education function (Luster).

Several general observations can be made as a result of the rising demand for more mid-career programs:

- Many urban-oriented academics do not possess the appropriate skills to train public-sector mid-career executives.
- Little effort has been made to discard the traditional hours-of-credit for more realistic approaches that reflect the learning and time needs of mid-career adults.
- Class distinctions still exist between regular academic offerings and continuing education programs.
- Few innovative approaches have been initiated to evaluate relevant experience of mid-careerists as alternatives to traditional academic admissions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

• Without proper incentives, few faculty members will work hard to keep in touch with current problems facing public officials (Wyman).

Voluntarism

Voluntarism refers to community oriented programs utilizing volunteer students from higher education. No formal papers were presented at this panel session. Panelists remarks and the ensuing discussion are summarized together.

Funding of volunteer programs can be a major problem. Foundations and government agencies have often provided seed money for a few years, but colleges and universities should not get involved in urban volunteer programs unless they are prepared to finance them. In some cases, student fees have helped to support volunteer programs.

Placing volunteers is an arduous and time-consuming task. Turnover among students is high, and assignments often differ from the original plans. One way to overcome this is to give students a major share in administrative authority over the program.

Keeping files on successful student placements and tangible achievements is a good way to maintain interest and continuity in the program. Students become links between the colleges and universities and local government agencies and community groups.

Concluding Note

To summarize the many programs, ideas, problem areas, and suggestions for future development presented in the concurrent panel sessions would be an almost impossible task. A number of general themes, however, recurred:

• The programs described indicate that there are many ways in which public and private institutions of higher education of all levels—junior and community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities—can relate to the urban scene within the context of instruction, research, student service, and public service. These programs, though, are only a sampling of the many ways colleges and universities are currently involved. There is need for continued creative and innovative thinking in the development of future urban programs.

• The funding of urban programs is a universal problem. Financial support is provided by Federal and foundation grants and by internal institutional funds, but such support is usually insufficient and short-term. Additional and long-term funding by institutions, Federal agencies, and foundations is a future requirement.

• Instruction, research, and public service should be viewed as interrelated functions in the urban involvement of colleges and universities. Major problems that need to be resolved in the future are lack of interest on the part of many faculty members, provision for interdisciplinary cooperation, and revision of the faculty-rewards system to recognize urban affairs activities.

• Many apparently successful programs are models of the urban involvement of higher education within the context of instruction, research, student services, public service, and institutional cooperation as represented by formal consortia. There is little or no real evidence though of their success—or failure. Colleges and universities need to develop techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of urban programs and projects.

4 Suggestions Derived from the Regional Conferences

The several committees concerned with planning the conferences agreed at the outset that the development of formal recommendations by the conferences would be infeasible. It was decided, however, that ideas and opinions voiced consistently at the four regional conferences should be assembled in the final report as suggestions for the consideration of colleges and universities, Federal, State, and local governments, and foundations.

The series of suggestions that follow were formulated by the writers of this report and reviewed by the chairmen of the local executive committees and the chairman of the conferences' advisory committee. The suggestions, consequently, are not official statements of the conference delegates, nor are they exhaustive, although we believe them to be a fair statement of the sense of the meetings. Other suggestions and recommendations by program participants appear in chapters two and three.

SUGGESTIONS

For Colleges and Universities

The college or university should:

- Undertake a thorough analysis of its resources to determine to what extent (if any) it should have an urban role. Executive leadership by the president or chancellor must be forceful, and all elements of the institutional community—especially the faculty—as well as its several publics must participate actively. Programs should be developed within the limits of what the college or university can do and at the same time preserve its basic function of higher education. Urban involvement should be viewed as relating to the traditional functions of instruction, research, student services, and public service.
- Provide financing specifically for its urban-related activities. Although outside funding from federal, foundation, business and other sources should be sought, the institution committed to urban involvement will allocate continuous support from institutional funds.
- Be aware of the implications of the New Federalism both as a present reality and a possible future development. Special revenue programs and bloc grants to states and local communities will require colleges and universities to develop channels of communication with decision-makers of city and county governments. Specific relationships with appropriate Federal regional offices, as well as with the city, county, and State agencies, will become increasingly necessary as the administration of Federal urban programs is further decentralized.
- Explore how it can best serve the educational needs of diverse groups in the urban population. In this context, consideration will have to be given to broad areas, such as: recruiting, admission, and financial aid policies; counseling and social adjustment programs; curriculum patterns and instructional practices, including the adoption of nontraditional learning procedures; educational outreach programs, including urban delivery systems; and continuing education, extending beyond the traditional age range of the collegiate population.
- Encourage widespread faculty involvement in urban affairs, facilitate interdisciplinary cooperation in instruction and research relating to the urban scene, and devise procedures that will recognize faculty participation in public service and urban-related activities.
- Establish cooperative urban programs with area postsecondary institutions and organizations having urban interests. An immediate response would be the organization of State and local area conferences to consider cooperative relationships with State and local governments; and for institutional leadership in organizing conferences and workshops for community leaders to explore what needs to be done to improve the quality of urban life. There is an immediate need for joint programs of neighboring black and white colleges and universities.
- Assure that affirmative action programs for educational offering and faculty and staff employment are effective and widely known in the community.
- Publicize its urban affairs program in order to contribute to community understanding of the institution's role and interests.
- Develop evaluation procedures for its urban-related programs and projects.

For the Federal Government

Federal government departments and agencies should:

- Prepare a policy statement on the participation of colleges and universities in Federally funded urban programs as a guide for both government and institution staffs.
- Publish periodically information on Federally funded urban-related programs that have potential for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

college and university contributions. (Recognition should be given to the fact that many such programs do not explicitly provide for the participation of institutions of higher education.)

- Inform colleges and universities of opportunities for urban involvement afforded by general and special revenue sharing programs; and about procedural changes as administration shifts from Washington to the regional council offices and State and local governments. In this connection the regional council offices might well develop an annual itinerary for teams of Federal officers who would spend a day on major campuses explaining their programs.
- Increase staff awareness of both higher education's resources for alleviating urban problems and the problems of colleges and universities in dealing with Government agencies.
- Seek ways to provide direct and substantial financial support for the urban-related programs of colleges and universities. Examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive: Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965; the Urban Observatories program; the RANN program of the National Science Foundation; fellowship, intern and career advancement programs; cooperative programs of postsecondary institutions and community organizations, such as the student opportunity centers; support of State and local consortia; conferences of postsecondary institutions and state and local government agencies; research and development projects; and innovative projects of individual colleges and universities.
- Solicit the advice and cooperation of colleges and universities in the initiation, planning, monitoring, and evaluation of urban programs in which they might take part.
- Seek ways to provide for continuity in the funding of programs.

For State Governments

State government departments and agencies should:

- Recognize that the urban involvement of colleges and universities is a legitimate function for them and not simply an esoteric or add-on activity. (In a recent study conducted by the American Council on Education, more than 99 percent of the colleges and universities indicated that urban involvement should be a function of American higher education.)
- Establish formal liaison with postsecondary institutions to inform them about programs under the purview of State agencies that provide opportunities for higher education participation.
- Develop and fund programs that provide for the urban affairs participation of colleges and universities. In this connection, one or more colleges or universities might well be designated to emphasize urban-related activities.
- Request college and university cooperation in the initiation, planning, monitoring, and evaluation of urban programs.
- Recognize that the widely used formulas for appropriations to State colleges and universities based entirely on student enrollments make it impossible for these institutions to develop effective urban affairs programs. Provision should be made for supplementing the formula to fund urban-related activities.
- Ensure that legislation allocating Federal funds—including general and special revenue sharing funds—channeled through the State for local governments includes recommendations that these governments utilize the services and resources of colleges and universities.

For City and Urban County Governments

City and urban county departments and agencies should:

- Explore with area colleges and universities the specific ways these institutions can contribute to the alleviation of urban problems within the scope of their legitimate functions. In this connection, local governments must take a realistic view of what colleges and universities can appropriately do.
- Establish formal relationships with colleges and universities by designating either a liaison officer, a coordinating committee, or a task force to serve in such a capacity. In this connection, an initial conference of city or county agency heads and college and university personnel might well be held.
- Request colleges and universities to develop, in cooperation with local government personnel, full-time and part-time programs designed to improve the personnel of local government agencies at entry, mid-career, and internship levels. Participation in mid-career programs could be encouraged by allowing released time or sabbatical leaves for public employees.
- Seek ways to utilize the resources of colleges and universities in the utilization of Federal grants for general and special revenue sharing programs.

* * *

- The National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, and International City Management Association should make specific efforts, through program topics, conferences, newsletters, and consultations, to encourage local governments to utilize the resources of postsecondary institutions in alleviating urban programs.

For Foundations

Foundations should:

- Review their funding policies to consider the need to include support of the urban-related activities of colleges and universities in their programs. They should announce their willingness to provide support for creative and innovative programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

• Be receptive to supporting the urban-related programs of higher education associations. Grants for the urban activities of three associations with the most active urban-related programs—the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the Council for University Institutes for Urban Affairs—have either expired or are about to expire. If these associations discontinue their urban involvement, little national leadership will be left in the area of urban involvement of higher education.

• Be receptive to funding proposals to meet the following major needs:

1. Colleges and universities and governmental agencies must be kept abreast of urban affairs developments by a generally distributed publication, sponsored by one of the major higher education associations. It became apparent at the conferences that college and university administrators, Federal, State, and local government officials, and people engaged in the urban affairs programs of colleges and universities are unaware of many facets of the urban-related activities of post-secondary institutions. Except for publications with limited circulation, there is currently no such medium of communication.
2. There is an urgent need for an extensive and in depth study of the role of higher education in urban affairs, conducted by a group of persons recognized and respected in the higher education community. This project could probably best be accomplished by a commission under the auspices of a major higher education association.

• Reconsider, in the case of the Ford Foundation, any intention to discontinue funding proposals for urban-related programs of colleges and universities.

The conferences were not intended to arrive at definite conclusions about the urban involvement of higher education. Many issues and problems were illuminated, but none resolved. Colleges and universities want to be involved in the urban scene—and a large majority of them are—but it is unclear how this can be accomplished. There is still no clear answer to the question raised at the conference by an official of the Ford Foundation, "What can we justifiably expect a university to contribute to solving this [previously stated] gamut of problems?"

5 A Task for the Future

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The conferences were not organized around issues and problems, nor were they designed to make original contributions to the body of knowledge about the urban involvement of higher education. It was intended that all participants give some attention to problems and needed future developments in the urban programs under consideration. We have identified a number of issues and problems related to the urban involvement of colleges and universities, which were referred to by the conference papers and discussions. A number of other suggestions by individual participants appear in various places in chapters two and three. Analysis of the issues and problems is not attempted.

It is suggested in chapter four that foundation support be provided for a definitive study of the urban involvement of higher education. The following listing indicates some of the unresolved issues and problems with which such a study would be concerned.

- How are the concepts, *urban affairs*, *urban involvement*, and *urban affairs programs*, to be defined so that there will be a common understanding of their meaning?
- How can colleges and universities justify expanding urban-related programs in light of financial conditions that necessitate reduction of other existing programs?
- To what extent do college and university administrators understand that urban affairs programs should be developed within the context of higher education's recognized functions: instruction, research, public service, and student services?
- How can colleges and universities best define their urban-related roles? Should they develop formal plans for their total urban affairs programs? If so, how can this be accomplished?
- Are urban-related roles different for universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges; for public and private institutions; for urban and nonurban institutions?
- Do the agricultural programs of the land-grant institutions provide an appropriate model for the urban-related programs of colleges and universities?
- Are new types of institutions of higher education utilizing nontraditional procedures required to meet the needs of urban populations?
- How can urban areas best be utilized as resources for the instructional programs of colleges and universities?
- How can the continuing education programs of colleges and universities be adapted to the needs and interests of urban populations?
- Should urban affairs be regarded as a distinct discipline in the college and university organization? Or is this field inherently interdisciplinary?
- What kinds of adjustments are needed for institutions of higher education, historically oriented to white middle-class clientele, to cope with the needs of urban populations that include the financially, culturally, and academically disadvantaged and diverse ethnic and racial groups?
- To what extent should colleges and universities provide open-access opportunities as an aspect of their urban involvement?
- Does community involvement of colleges and universities lead to undesirable relationships: politization, community control, unrealistic community expectations? If so, how can these be avoided?
- What specific provisions should be made in general education curricula to prepare all undergraduate students for effective participation in the contemporary urban culture?
- How can colleges and universities develop effective cooperative programs through the organization of consortia for urban involvement—by involving other institutions of higher education or by involving nonacademic organizations with urban interests?
- How can colleges and universities provide adequate funding for urban affairs programs—from institutional funds, Federal, State, and local government grants, foundations, or corporate sources? How can they strengthen their relationships with these several funding sources? How can they ascertain what funds are available from such sources? How can these funding agencies be brought to recognize colleges and universities as a resource in the alleviation of urban problems?
- How can colleges and universities establish cooperative relationships with city and county local government agencies in areas of instruction, research, and service?
- How should urban affairs program be organized and administered in universities, large and small four-year colleges, and in two-year colleges?
- How can colleges and universities adapt their procedures to the new conditions imposed by Federal,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

general, and revenue sharing and by the administrative decentralization of Federal agencies?

- How can faculty members in the established disciplines be encouraged to develop an interest in urban involvement? How can departmental faculties implement interdisciplinary cooperation in urban affairs programs? How can colleges and universities restructure their reward systems to encourage greater faculty involvement in urban programs?
- What is the responsibility of the college or university as a corporate entity in its relations with the urban area in which it is located?
- How can the effectiveness of the urban affairs programs be evaluated?
- What is the urban-related role of postsecondary institutions other than colleges and universities?
- How can higher education associations best relate to the urban involvement of their members?
- How can information about the urban affairs programs of colleges and universities be disseminated in the higher education community and to Federal, State, and local government agencies?

Appendix A Selected Readings

Prepared by Bernard H. Ross
American University

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The. *The Campus and the City.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Hennessy, Bernard C. *Political Internships: Theory and Practice.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Holleb, Doris B. *Colleges and the Urban Poor: The Role of Public Higher Education in Community Service.* Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1972.

Jenkins, Martin D. *Guidelines for Institutional Self-Study of Involvement in Urban Affairs.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1971.

Kerr, Clark. *Higher Education in the Troubled City.* Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 1971.

Mitchell, Howard E. *The University and the Urban Crisis.* New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974.

Murphy, Thomas P. *Universities and the Urban Crisis.* New York: Dunellen Co., 1974.

Nash, George; with Price, Robert E., and Waldorf, Dan. *The University and the City: Eight Cases of Involvement.* A Report Prepared for The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Nash, George, and Waldorf, Dan. *The University and the City: Final Report.* Washington: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1971.

Office of Urban Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *A Guide to Federal Funds for Urban Programs at Colleges and Universities.* 1972-73 ed. Washington: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1972.

Ritterbush, Philip C., ed. *Let the Entire Community Become Our University.* Washington: Acropolis Books, 1973.

Ross, Bernard H. *University-City Relations: From Coexistence to Cooperation.* ERIC Higher Education Research Report. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1973.

Ross, Bernard H., and Fritschler, A. Lee. *Urban Affairs Bibliography: An Annotated Guide to Literature in the Field.* Washington: School of Government, American University, 1974 (forthcoming).

Taher, Grace M., ed. *University Urban Research Centers.* 2d ed. Washington: Urban Institute, 1971.

Urban Affairs Newsletter. Washington: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Published quarterly.

Washington, Walter E.; and Hanson, Royce. *The University and the City: Two Views.* Washington: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, 1969.

Zauderer, Donald G. *University Internships in Higher Education.* ERIC Higher Education Research Report. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.

Appendix B Programs of the Four Regional Conferences

[Note: Substitutions, changes, and additions appear at the end of this appendix.]

WASHINGTON, D.C.	MARCH 1–2, 1974	MAYFLOWER HOTEL

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1974

PRELIMINARY EVENTS

5:00-8:00 p.m. Registration
7:00-9:00 p.m. Informal Reception for Early Registrants (Presidential Room)

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1974

8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Registration—*Continued*

9:00-10:00 a.m. **OPENING GENERAL SESSION**
Ballroom
Presiding: George H. Williams, President, American University
Purposes and Definitions: Roger W. Heyns, President, American Council on Education
Keynote Address: Marvin Wachman, President, Temple University

10:20 a.m.-12 m. **CONCURRENT PANEL SESSIONS**
How Higher Education Has Met Urban Needs, and Needed Future Developments

1. Applied Social Research

Maryland Room
Chairperson: Casey Mann II, Chairman, Department of Community Planning and Development, Federal City College
Recorder: Beverly C. Reece, Georgetown University
Panelists: Henry Cohen, Dean, Center for New York City Affairs, New School for Social Research
Robert L. Crain, Senior Research Associate, Center for Metropolitan Planning and Research, Johns Hopkins University (paper read by Jack C. Fisher, Director of the Center)
Carl M. Franklin, Director, Morgan Ownership Management Development Institute, Center for Urban Affairs, Morgan State College

2. Application of Science and Technology to Urban Problems

Pennsylvania Suite
Chairperson: A. Lee Fritschler, Dean, School of Government and Public Administration, American University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recorder: Richard O. Taubald, University of Maryland, College Park
Panelists: Anthony Walters, Assistant Dean, School of Urban and Public Affairs, Carnegie-Mellon University
Harry E. Hickey, Assistant Professor, Fire Protection Curriculum, University of Maryland, College Park

3. Continuing Education and Community Service

New York Suite
Chairperson: Joseph Pettit, Dean, School of Summer and Continuing Education, Georgetown University
Recorder: Marguerite Beatty, Washington Consortium of Universities
Panelists: Clarence Blake, Professor, Department of Adult Education, Federal City College
Stephen Zwerling, Director, Circle 73, Staten Island Community College, City University of New York

4. University Relationships to Minority Communities

East Room
Chairperson: Dorn McGrath, Chairman, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, George Washington University
Recorder: James F. Murley, George Washington University
Panelists: Thomas Hartman, Professor, Urban Planning and Policy Development, Livingston College, Rutgers University
Howard E. Mitchell, Sr., Director of Human Resources, University of Pennsylvania

5. University Organization and Administration for Urban Programs

Cabinet Room
Chairperson: Clarence C. Mondale, Director, Division of Experimental Programs, George Washington University
Recorder: Gregory H. Williams, George Washington University
Panelists: H. Parker Lansdale, Director, Higher Education Center for Urban Studies, Bridgeport, Connecticut
Francis X. Tannian, Professor of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware

6. Urban Instructional Programs

Senate Room
Chairperson: Mary Berry, Acting Provost, University of Maryland, College Park
Recorder: Gale C. Rothrock, George Washington University
Panelists: David C. Brown, Director, Washington Semester Program, College of Public Affairs, American University
John H. Strange, Dean of College III, University of Massachusetts at Boston
Donald G. Zauderer, Director, Public Administration, College of Public Affairs, American University

LUNCHEON SESSION (Luncheon ticket required)

12:15-1:30 p.m.
State Room
Presiding: Lloyd H. Elliott, President, George Washington University
Greetings: The Honorable Walter E. Washington, Mayor of the District of Columbia
Address: *New Directions in the Federal Funding of Urban Programs*
Michael Moskow, Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1:45-3:20 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

How States and Local Communities Can Interact With Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems

Ballroom

Presiding: Cleveland Dennard, President, Washington Technical Institute

Panelists: Philip Rutledge, Director, Office of Policy Analysis, National League of Cities, and U.S. Conference of Mayors

R. Kenneth Barnes, Secretary, Maryland Department of Budget and Fiscal Planning; representing the Council of State Governments and the National Governors Conference

James P. Gleason, County Executive, Montgomery County, Maryland; representing the National Association of Counties

Larry Blick, City Manager, Rockville, Maryland; representing the International City Management Association

John Ingram, Associate Director for Administrative and Supporting Services, Government of the District of Columbia

Resource Person: Bernard H. Ross, Associate Professor, School of Government and Public Administration, College of Public Affairs, American University

3:30-4:15 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

Ballroom

Presiding: Charles E. Bishop, Chancellor, University of Maryland, College Park

Address: *How a Foundation Has Aided Urban Programs of Colleges and Universities, and Needed New Directions*

William C. Pendleton, Program Officer, Urban and Metropolitan Development, The Ford Foundation

4:20-5:45 p.m. **CONCURRENT PANEL SESSIONS**

The program of the 10:20 a.m. session will be repeated.
Same speakers and room numbers.

6:15-7:15 p.m. **RECEPTION**

Chinese Room For all delegates, spouses, and visitors

SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1974

9:00-11:00 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

Opportunities for College and University Involvement in Federal Urban Programs: Problems and Prospects

Ballroom

Presiding: Paul P. Cooke, President, District of Columbia Teachers College

Chairperson: Clifford W. Graves, Deputy Associate Director for Evaluation and Program Implementation, Office of Management and Budget

Panelists: Larry Dale, Assistant to the Director, Washington, D.C., Area Office, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Kenneth McLennan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Development, U.S. Department of Labor

Evelyn Mullen, Senior Program Officer, Library Service, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Charles Sorrentino, Manpower Specialist, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Kenneth Urban, D.D.S., Dental Officer, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Max Wallenburg, Manpower Training and Development Specialist, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11:15 a.m.-12:30 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**—*Continued*
What Changes Are Needed in Colleges and Universities to Enhance Their Urban Involvement?

Ballroom

Presiding: Paul P. Cooke, President, District of Columbia Teachers College

Chairperson: Morris W. H. Collins, Jr., Dean, College of Public Affairs, American University

Panelists:
Kenneth J. Bertrand, Chairman, Department of Geography, Catholic University of America
Walter B. Lewis, Associate Dean, School of Architecture and Planning, Howard University
Joan C. Lomax, Professor of Political Science, Montgomery College
Thomas P. Murphy, Director, Institute for Urban Affairs, University of Maryland, College Park
Norman W. Nickens, Dean, Continuing Education, Washington Technical Institute
Robert Williams, Professor of Psychology, District of Columbia Teachers College

12:30 p.m. **ADJOURNMENT**

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
MARCH 15–16, 1974 THE JACK TAR HOTEL

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1974

PRELIMINARY EVENTS

5:00-8:00 p.m. Registration
7:00-9:00 p.m. Informal Reception for Early Registrants (Gas Buggy Room)

FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1974

8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Registration—*Continued*

9:00-10:00 a.m. **OPENING GENERAL SESSION**
El Dorado Room

Presiding: Richard M. Sax, Executive Director, San Francisco Consortium

Greetings: The Honorable Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco

Purposes and Definitions: Martin D. Jenkins, Director, Office of Urban Affairs, American Council on Education

Keynote Address: The Reverend William C. McInnes, S.J., President, University of San Francisco

10:20 a.m.-12 m. **CONCURRENT PANEL SESSIONS**
How Higher Education Has Met Urban Needs, and Needed Future Developments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Community and Public Service

Pacific Heights Room

Chairperson: Frank Newman, Director, University Relations, Stanford University
Recorder: Ruth K. Franklin, Kramer, Miller & Associates, San Francisco
Panelists: May Diaz, Director, Center for Continuing Education of Women, University of California, Berkeley
Ira S. Fink, University Community Planner, Office of the President, University of California
Daniel L. McFadden, Special Assistant to the Chancellor, University of California, Santa Cruz

2. Faculty Involvement

Presidio Room

Chairperson: Donald R. Gerth, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, California State University, Chico
Recorder: Eloise L. Helwig, Director of Development, Hastings College of the Law, University of California
Panelists: Randy H. Hamilton, Dean, Graduate School of Public Administration, Golden Gate University
John Kerrigan, Chairman, Division of Public Administration, School of Community Services and Public Affairs, University of Oregon
Frank Marini, Dean, College of Arts and Letters, San Diego State University
Norman Schneider, Director, Urban Affairs Program, San Francisco State University

3. Interinstitutional Cooperation

Marina Room

Chairperson: Malcolm S. M. Watts, M.D., Associate Dean, School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco; Chairman, Board of Trustees, San Francisco Consortium
Recorder: Rhoda Kaufman, Senior Administrative Analyst, Health Sciences and Medical Education, University of California, Berkeley
Panelists: Lloyd J. Averill, President, Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education
Robert Kroepsch, Executive Director, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
George E. McCabe, Director, Consortium of California State University and Colleges, Los Angeles

4. Minority Relationships

Sea Cliff Room

Chairperson: Bernice B. Brown, Dean of Students, Lone Mountain College
Recorder: Claudia Cassidy, Director, Career Life Planning, Mills College
Panelists: Lance Blakesley, Director of Urban Studies, Loyola Marymount University
James A. Hirabayashi, Dean, Ethnic Studies, San Francisco State University
Elizabeth Schenkein, Administrative Analyst, County Manager's Office, San Mateo County, California
Norvell Smith, Associate Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs, University of California, Berkeley

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. Planning

Gas Buggy A Room

Chairperson and Panelists: The Honorable John Vasconcellos, Assemblyman, and Chairman of the State of California Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education; and Friends

Recorder: Florence Schwartz, Coordinator of Academic Advising Services, San Francisco State University

6. Research

Gas Buggy B Room

Chairperson: Durward Long, Vice-President, Extended Academic and Public Service Programs, University of California, Berkeley

Recorder: Donna Solomon, Executive Director, Experience Reserve Bank, American Jewish Congress

Panelists: Eugene C. Lee, Director, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley

Charles J. Ries, Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles

Richard E. Watson, Executive Director, County Supervisors Association of California

LUNCHEON SESSION (Luncheon ticket required)

12:15-1:30 p.m.

International Room

Presiding: Paul F. Romberg, President, San Francisco State University

Greetings: The Honorable Diane Feinstein, President, Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco

Introduction: Malcolm S. M. Watts, M.D., Associate Dean, School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco; Chairman, Board of Trustees, San Francisco Consortium

Address: *New Directions in the Federal Funding of Urban Programs*
The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

1:45-3:20 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

How States and Local Communities Can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems

El Dorado Room

Presiding: Albert H. Bowker, Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley

Panelists: Donald Benninghoven, Executive Director, League of California Cities

Michael W. Poggenburg, Executive Secretary, California Council on Intergovernmental Relations, Sacramento

George A. Sipel, City Manager, Palo Alto, California

Resource Person: Bernard H. Ross, Associate Professor, School of Government and Public Administration, College of Public Affairs, American University

3:30-5:15 **GENERAL SESSION**

Opportunities for College and University Involvement in Federal Urban Programs: Problems and Prospects

El Dorado Room

Presiding: Clifford W. Graves, Deputy Associate Director for Evaluation and Program Implementation, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Panelists: Edward Aguirre, Regional Commissioner, U.S. Office of Education, Region IX, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Fernando E. C. De Baca, Chairman, Western Federal Regional Council; Regional Director, Region IX, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Eugene Gonzales, Regional Director, Region IX, Office of Economic Opportunity
Elizabeth Tapscott, Assistant Regional Administrator for Community Development, Region IX, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

6:15-7:15 p.m. **RECEPTION**
Golden Gate Room For all delegates, spouses, and visitors

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1974

9:00-10:45 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION**
How the Business Community Can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs
El Dorado Room
Presiding: Stanley P. Hebert, Vice-President, Urban Affairs, Bank of America
Panelists: M. Carl Holman, President, National Urban Coalition
Henry S. Rowen, Professor of Urban Management, Stanford University
Dow Votaw, Professor, School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley

11:00 a.m.-12:15 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**–*Continued*
What Changes Are Needed in Colleges and Universities to Enhance Their Urban Involvement: What Is Possible?
El Dorado Room
Presiding: Henry K. Evers, C.I.C., Stephenson & Evers, Investment Managers, San Francisco; Officer, Board of Trustees, San Francisco Consortium
Panelists: Otto Butz, President, Golden Gate University
John A. Greenlee, President, California State University, Los Angeles; Chairman, Committee on Urban Affairs, American Council on Education
Gus Guichard, Vice-Chancellor, California Community Colleges
Robert G. Randolph, Public Relations Counsel, Youth and Education, Standard Oil of California, San Francisco

12:15 p.m. **ADJOURNMENT**

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS MARCH 29–30, 1974 THE DRAKE HOTEL

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1974

PRELIMINARY EVENTS

5:00-8:00 p.m. Registration
7:00-9:00 p.m. Informal Reception for Early Registrants (Parlor F and G)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1974

8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Registration—*Continued*

9:00-10:15 a.m. **OPENING GENERAL SESSION**
Grand Ballroom

Presiding: Oscar Shabat, Chancellor, Chicago City Colleges
Greetings: The Honorable Neil Hartigan, Lieutenant Governor, State of Illinois
Purposes and Definitions: Martin D. Jenkins, Director, Office of Urban Affairs, American Council on Education
Keynote Address: Warren G. Bennis, President, University of Cincinnati

10:30 a.m.-12:15 p.m. **CONCURRENT PANEL SESSIONS**
How Different Types of Institutions of Higher Education Have Responded to Urban Needs, and Needed Future Developments

1. Research Institutions
West Mezzanine 9 Room

Chairpersons: David Epperson, Master, College of Community Studies, Northwestern University
Arthur Hillman, Director of Urban Affairs, Roosevelt University
Recorder: Darlene Doherty, Graduate Assistant, Roosevelt University
Panelists: Louis Massotti, Director, Center for Urban Affairs, Northwestern University
Eldon Johnson, Vice-President for Governmental Relations and Public Service, University of Illinois
William Irwin, Director, Milwaukee Urban Observatory, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee
Michael Pap, Cleveland Urban Observatory, John Carroll University
Charles Orlebeke, Dean, College of Urban Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Wayne Hoffman, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago

2. Urban Public Universities
West Mezzanine 10 Room

Chairperson: Michael B. Goldstein, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Urban Affairs, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Recorder: Sheila Castillo, Staff Associate, Chancellor's Office, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Panelists: Warren B. Cheston, Chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Carlo Golino, Chancellor, University of Massachusetts at Boston

3. Community and Junior Colleges
West Mezzanine 11 Room

Chairperson: Salvatore Rotella, Dean, Public Service Institute, City College of Chicago
Recorder: David Heller, President, Loop College
Panelists: Herbert Zeitlin, President, Triton College
Oscar Shabat, Chancellor, Chicago City Colleges
Marie Martin, Director, Community Colleges Branch, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Peter Masiko, President, Miami-Dade Community College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. Nontraditional Learning Systems

West Mezzanine 16 Room

Chairpersons: Reynold Feldman, Director, Center for Program Development, Northeastern Illinois University
Roger Pulliam, College of Urban Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Recorder: Patricia Wright, Graduate Assistant, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Panelists: David Sweet, President, Minnesota Metropolitan State College
Robert Green, Dean, College of Urban Development, Michigan State University
James Mullen, President, Northeastern Illinois University
Edith Williams, Western Michigan University
James Woodruff, Provost, University of Detroit

5. Professional Institutions

West Mezzanine 17 Room

Chairperson: Doris Holleb, Director, Metropolitan Institute, University of Chicago

Recorder: Patricia McFate, Staff Associate, Chancellor's Office, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Panelists: I. W. Cole, Dean, School of Journalism, Northwestern University
Anthony Diekema, Associate Chancellor, University of Illinois at the Medical Center
Harold Richman, Dean, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago

12:30-2:00 p.m. **LUNCHEON SESSION** (Luncheon ticket required)

Gold Coast Room

Presiding: Warren B. Cheston, Chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Greetings: The Honorable Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago

Address: *New Directions in the Federal Funding of Urban Programs*
Norman A. Erbe, Chairman, Federal Regional Council, Region V; Regional Representative of the Secretary of Transportation

2:15-4:00 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

How States and Local Communities Can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems

Grand Ballroom

Presiding: James Mullen, President, Northeastern Illinois University

Panelists: Stanley Cowle, County Administrator, Hennepin County, Minnesota; representing the National Association of Counties
John F. Fischbach, Assistant City Manager, Lake Forest, Illinois; representing the International City Management Association
Joe E. Nusbaum, Secretary, Department of Administration, State of Wisconsin; representing the Council of State Governments and the National Governors Conference
The Honorable Henry Maier, Mayor of the City of Milwaukee; representing the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors

Resource Person: Bernard H. Ross, Associate Professor, School of Government and Public Administration, College of Public Affairs, American University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4:15-5:15 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**
How Foundations Have Aided the Urban Involvement of Higher Education, and Needed New Directions
Grand Ballroom
Presiding: The Very Reverend John R. Cortelyou, President, DePaul University
Panelists: David J. Christensen, Vice-President, CNA Financial Corporation, and Director, Corporate Responsibility
Robert MacGregor, President, Chicago United

6:15-7:15 p.m. **RECEPTION**
French Room For all delegates, spouses, and visitors

SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1974

9:00-11:00 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION**
Opportunities for College and University Involvement in Federal Urban Programs: Problems and Prospects
Grand Ballroom
Presiding: Walter L. Walker, Vice-President for Planning, University of Chicago
Panelists: Mary Jane Calais, Regional Commissioner, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Edward A. Goodbout, Assistant Regional Director, Procurement Assistance, Small Business Administration
Gordon Nelson, Manpower Specialist, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
Lewis F. Nicolini, Executive Assistant to the Assistant Regional Director for Manpower, U.S. Department of Labor
Dean Swartzel, Assistant Regional Director for Planning and Management, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Harold C. Wieland, Special Assistant to the Chairman for Regional Council, U.S. Department of Transportation

11:15 a.m.-12:30 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**—*Continued*
What Changes Are Needed in Colleges and Universities to Enhance Their Urban Involvement: What Is Possible?
Grand Ballroom
Presiding: Rolf Weil, President, Roosevelt University
Panelists: Eugene Eidenberg, Vice-Chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Ray Mack, Vice-President and Dean of Faculties, Northwestern University

12:30 p.m. **ADJOURNMENT**

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA APRIL 5–6, 1974 BRANIFF PLACE HOTEL

THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1974

PRELIMINARY EVENTS

5:00-8:00 p.m. Registration
7:00-9:00 p.m. Informal Reception for Early Registrants (Meeting Room #1)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FRIDAY, APRIL 5, 1974

8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Registration—*Continued*

9:00-10:00 a.m. **OPENING GENERAL SESSION**
Tulane Room
Presiding: Norman Francis, President, Xavier University of Louisiana
Purposes and Definitions: Stephen K. Bailey, Vice-President, American Council on Education
Keynote Address: Granville M. Sawyer, President, Texas Southern University

10:20 a.m.-12 m. **CONCURRENT PANEL SESSIONS**
How Higher Education Has Met Urban Needs, and Needed Future Development.

1. State-Based Programs

Terrace Suite 1 & 2
Chairperson: Robert C. Whittemore, Dean, University College, Tulane University
Recorder: Karen Shaw, Loyola University
Panelists: David A. Boileau, Executive Director, Louisiana Committee for the Humanities
Cora Norman, Executive Director, Mississippi Committee for the Humanities

2. Mid-Career Training

Meeting Room 4 & 5
Chairperson: Ralph E. Thayer, Director, Urban Studies Institute, University of New Orleans
Recorder: Gregory Ridenour, Graduate Student, Tulane University
Panelists: Sherman Wyman, Director, Urban Studies Institute, University of Texas at Arlington
Robert Juster, Director of Research, Urban Studies Program, University of Alabama

3. Toward Urban (Land) Grant Institutions?

Meeting Room 2
Chairperson: Raymond P. Witte, Dean, Community Services Division, Delgado Junior College
Recorder: William Ziff, Graduate Student, Tulane University
Panelists: Fritz McCameron, Director, Division of Continuing Education, Louisiana State University
John Powell, Coordinator, Special Programs, Louisiana State University

4. Building Community Interest in Colleges and Universities

Tulane Room
Chairperson: Lawrence S. Hallaron II, Director, Continuing Education, St. Mary's Dominican College
Recorder: Virginia Lorbear, University of New Orleans
Panelists: Mary H. Ellis, Executive Director, New Orleans Consortium, Xavier University of New Orleans
Margery Stich, Volunteer Director, VIGOR

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. University Contributions to the Urban Community

Meeting Room 10

Chairperson: Carrie McHenry, Coordinator, Urbinvolve Program, Xavier University of Louisiana

Recorder: Gary Kaplan, Tulane University

Panelists: Frank X. Delany, Executive Director, Urban Studies and Community Services Center, LaSalle College

Hortense W. Dixon, Director of Urban Research Center, Texas Southern University

12:15-1:30 p.m. **LUNCHEON SESSION** (Luncheon ticket required)

Imperial Salon

Presiding: Sister Enda Eileen, President, Our Lady of Holy Cross College

Invocation: The Most Reverend Harold R. Perry, Auxiliary Bishop of New Orleans

Welcome: Anthony Gagliano, Executive Assistant to the Mayor, City of New Orleans

Address: *New Directions in the Federal Funding of Urban Programs*

Arthur W. Busch, Regional Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Region XI; Chairman, Southwest Federal Regional Council, Region XI

1:45-3:20 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

How States and Local Communities Can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems

Tulane Room

Presiding: Homer L. Hitt, Chancellor, University of New Orleans

Panelists: Patrick W. Ryan, Executive Director, Office of State Planning, Office of the Governor, Louisiana

Dean Hunter, Chief Administrative Officer, City of New Orleans

The Honorable W.W. Dumas, Mayor-President, East Baton Rouge Parish

Resource Person: Bernard H. Ross, Associate Professor, College of Public Affairs, American University

3:30-4:15 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION**

Tulane Room

Presiding: Emmett Bashful, Vice-President, Southern University in New Orleans

Address: *How a Foundation Has Aided Urban Programs of Colleges and Universities, and Needed New Directions*

William C. Pendleton, Program Officer, Urban and Metropolitan Development, The Ford Foundation

4:20-5:45 p.m. **CONCURRENT PANEL SESSIONS**

How Higher Education Has Met Urban Needs, and Needed Future Developments

1. Meeting Urban Needs

Terrace Suite 1 & 2

Chairperson: Betty Morrison, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Our Lady of Holy Cross College

Recorder: Karen Shaw, Loyola University

Panelists: Walter B. Clancy, School of Social Work, University of Arkansas at Little Rock

William R. Gable, Dean, School of Urban Life, Georgia State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Costs of Urban Programs and Who Will Pay

Meeting Room 10

Chairperson: Albert Wetzel, Director, Office of University Development, Tulane University
Recorder: William Ziff, Graduate Student, Tulane University
Panelists: James R. Bobo, Dean, Graduate School, University of New Orleans
Darwin C. Fenner, Investment Counselor

3. Revenue Sharing

Meeting Room 2

Chairperson: Ralph E. Thayer, Director, Urban Studies Institute, University of New Orleans
Recorder: Gregory Ridenour, Tulane University
Panelists: Terrance Duvernay, Assistant City Administrative Officer, Federal Programs, City of New Orleans
Leon Tarver, Director, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Baton Rouge

4. Coordination of Research and Public Service

Meeting Room 4 &5

Chairperson: William W. Shaw, Director, Urban Studies Center, Tulane University
Recorder: James Renner, University of New Orleans
Panelists: Joseph Reynolds, Vice-President for Instruction and Research, Louisiana State University
Melvin M. Gruwell, Director, Center for Teacher Education, Tulane University

5. Voluntarism: Untapped Resources

Tulane Room

Chairperson: Carrie McHenry, Coordinator, Urbinvolve Programs, Xavier University of Louisiana
Recorder: Virginia Lorbear, University of New Orleans
Panelists: Susie Graham, Coordinator of VIGOR
Gideon Stanton, Director, CACTUS, Tulane University

5:45-7:00 p.m. **RECEPTION**
Imperial Salon For all delegates, spouses, and visitors

SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1974

9:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION**
Tulane Room

Opportunities for College and University Involvement in Federal Urban Programs—Problems and Prospects

Presiding: Marvin E. Thames, President, Delgado Junior College
Panelists: Ed Foreman, Regional Director, Region V, U.S. Department of Transportation
Willard Lewis, Special Assistant to the Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, Southwest Region
Scott Tuxhorn, Acting Regional Director, Region V, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Ernest C. Woods, Staff Director, Southwest Federal Regional Council
William Cecil, Department of Labor Representative to the Southwest Federal Regional Council
Kenton Kirkpatrick, Environmental Protection Agency Representative to the Southwest Federal Regional Council

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11:15 a.m.-12:30 p.m. CONCLUDING SESSION
Tulane Room

What Changes Are Needed in Colleges and Universities to Enhance Their Urban Involvement

Presiding: Herbert E. Longenecker, President, Tulane University
Provocateur: Mary Zervigon, Aide to the Mayor, City of New Orleans
Responder: Daniel C. Thompson, Professor of Sociology and Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Dillard University
Provocateur: O. Pat Morgan, Program Development Coordinator, Louisiana Educational Television Authority
Responder: The Rev. James Carter, Acting President, Loyola University
Provocateur: John A. Sessions, Assistant Director of Education, AFL-CIO
Responder: Judge Ernest C. Morial, Juvenile Court, City of New Orleans
Provocateur: Patrick O'Keefe, Law Student, Loyola University
Responder: Frank T. Birtel, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Tulane University

PROGRAM CHANGES

The following persons served as substitutes for those listed in the programs:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Panel 6. Urban Instructional Programs
Stephen I. Rosen, Assistant Provost, Behavioral and Social Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park (for Marry Berry)

General Session: What Changes Are Needed in Colleges and Universities to Enhance Their Urban Involvement?
Lenora Cole, Vice President for Student Life, The American University (for Walter B. Lewis)
Irvin Gordy, Associate Dean of Continuing Education, Washington Technical Institute (for Norman Nickens)

SAN FRANCISCO

Panel 2. Faculty Involvement
Allen Haile, Associate Professor of Public Administration, Golden Gate University (for Randy Hamilton)

Panel 5. Planning
Austin Thompson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley
Arthur Pearl, Professor of Education, and Chairman, Committee on Education, University of California, Santa Cruz
Bruce Fuller, Consultant, Joint Commission on the Master Plan for Higher Education

CHICAGO

Panel 5. Professional Institutions
Lawrence Hall, Associate Dean, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago (for Harold Richman)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General Session: How States and Local Communities Can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems

Charles Stinnett, Assistant City Manager, Parkridge, Illinois (for John F. Fischbach)

Marvin Goldstein, Planning and Budget Office, State of Wisconsin (for Joe E. Nusbaum)

General Session: How Foundations Have Aided the Urban Involvement of Higher Education, and Needed New Directions

Adrienne Y. Bailey, Program Associate, Chicago Community Trust

NEW ORLEANS

Panel 3. Toward Urban (Land) Grant Institutions?

James Sylvest, Assistant Director, Division of Continuing Education, Louisiana State University (for Fritz McCameron)

Panel 4. Building Community Interest in Colleges and Universities

Christine Mae, University of New Orleans (for Virginia Lorbear)

Louise Glichman, Administrator, VIGOR (for Magery Stich)

Panel 5. University Contributions to the Urban Community

Eugene Cizele, School of Architecture, Tulane University (for Frank X. Delany)

Luncheon Session

Emmett Moten, Mayor's Office, City of New Orleans (for Anthony Gagliano)

Ernest C. Woods, Staff Director, Southwest Federal Regional Council, Region XI (for Arthur W. Busch)

General Session: How States and Local Communities Can Interact with Colleges and Universities in Urban Programs: Prospects and Problems

Allen Rosensweig, Policy Planning Staff, Office of the Mayor, City of New Orleans (for Dean Hunter)

Panel 2. Costs of Urban Programs and Who Will Pay

Ed Nebel, Assistant Dean, College of Business Administration, University of New Orleans, (for James R. Bobo)

Panel 3. Revenue Sharing

Carl Wilkins, Federal Programs Analyst, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Baton Rouge (for Leon Tarver)

Panel 5. Voluntarism: Untapped Resources

Christine Mae, University of New Orleans (for Virginia Lorbear)

General Session: Opportunities for College and University Involvement in Federal Urban Programs–Problems and Prospects

Burt Sanford, Deputy Regional Director, Region V, U.S. Department of Transportation (for Ed Foreman)

David Baker, Chief, Federal State Relations, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Southwest Region (for Willard Lewis)

Carroll Galbreath, Director of Higher Education, Region V, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (for Scott Tuxhorn)

Concluding Session: What Changes Are Needed in Colleges and Universities to Enhance Their Urban Involvement

Cheryl Epling, United Teachers of New Orleans (for John A. Sessions)

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1974—558-944

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE CONFERENCES

Chairman: John A. Greenlee, President, California State College at Los Angeles; Chairman, Committee on Urban Affairs, American Council on Education

Stephen K. Bailey, Vice-President, American Council on Education

Harry Bard, President, Community College of Baltimore

George A. Bell, Director of Research, The Council of State Governments

Winnie Bengelsdorf, Administrator, Office of Urban Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

King V. Cheek, President, Morgan State College

James L. Cox, Executive Director, Council of University Institutes for Urban Affairs

Cheryl J. Dobbins, Associate Director of Program Development, Black Colleges and Community Development Program, Technical Assistance Consortium To Improve College Services

Stephen H. Gamble, Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Program Development and Research, U S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Bernard Michael, Executive Director, Federal Interagency Committee on Education, U.S. Office of Education

Oscar L. Mims, Community Development Program Specialist, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Wesley W. Posvar, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh

Clarence C. Walton, President, The Catholic University of America

J. Eugene Welden, Acting Chief, Continuing Education and Community Service, U.S. Office of Education

Lawrence A. Williams, Staff Director, Urban Observatory, The National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors

PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE CONFERENCES

Winnie Bengelsdorf, Administrator, Office of Urban Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Robert C. Brictson, Director of Research Programs, Program Development and Public Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

James L. Cox, Executive Director, Council of University Institutes for Urban Affairs

Homer E. Favor, Dean, Center for Urban Affairs, Morgan State College

Roy Jones, Director, Community Studies, Howard University

Alex B. Lacy, Jr., Dean, School of Urban Life, Georgia State University

Howard E. Mitchell, 1907 Foundation Professor of Urbanism and Human Resources, University of Pennsylvania

George Nash, Project Director, Drug Abuse Treatment Information Project, Montclair State College

Bernard H. Ross, Associate Professor, School of Government and Public Administration, The American University

Lawrence A. Williams, Staff Director, Urban Observatory, The National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors

Dorothy Williams, Government Technical Representative, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

CONFERENCE STAFF

Roger W. Heyns, President, American Council on Education; *ex officio*

Martin D. Jenkins, Director, Office of Urban Affairs, American Council on Education; *Conference Director*

Bernard H. Ross, Associate Professor, School of Government and Public Administration, The American University; *Consultant*

Dorothy Williams and Malachi Knowles, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; *Government Technical Representatives*

Patricia Tatum Williams, Staff Assistant, Office of Urban Affairs, American Council on Education; *Conference Coordinator*